

REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's helpful comments in the preceding Office Action concerning the teachings of the newly cited Sugimoto et al reference (U.S. Patent 5,981,048). However, in view of the foregoing amendments, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for immediate allowance.

The previous rejection of claims 1-3 as being anticipated by Sugimoto et al under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) are deemed moot in view of their cancellation.

However, reconsideration of the previous rejection of claim 5-7, 10, 12-13, 15-16, 18 and 20 are respectfully requested in view of the following comments.

As the Examiner notes, Sugimoto can only be alleged to "anticipate" the claimed invention if the Kraft paper layer 6 (Fig. 3) is presumed to be "coated" by layer 1A. However, it is clear from the teaching of Sugimoto et al that the Kraft paper layer 6 is not in direct contact with a conductive polymeric composition according to independent claim 5. This has been emphasized by currently amended claim 5 by reciting that the "paper layer coated in direct contact with a conductive polymeric composition consisting of" Thus, it is clear that Sugimoto cannot anticipate independent claim 5 or dependent claim 7 directly dependent thereon or on claims 10 (and dependent claims 11, 12 and 13, directly or indirectly dependent thereon) which state that the paper layer is in direct contact with the conductive polymeric composition.

Still further, independent claim 15 has been amended to further define the laminate as having, as outer layers of the laminate, "a coating, the coating comprising"

It is clear from the Examiner's comments that the Examiner is relying on Fig. 4 of the Sugimoto et al reference for rejecting these claims and it is clear that this teaching of Sugimoto et al does not meet the limitations of claim 15 (and dependent claims 16-18 and 20 directly dependent thereon).

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, applicants respectfully request that Sugimoto cannot possibly establish an anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) for the claimed invention and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The previous rejection of claims 1-3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berbeco (U.S. Patent 4,596,668) in view of Sugimoto et al is deemed moot in view of the

cancellation of these claims, as is the further rejection of claim 3 over the combination of Berbeco and Sugimoto et al and further in view of Felter et al (U.S. Patent 4,895,886).


However, reconsideration of the previous rejection of claims 5, 10-12, 15-18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Keough (U.S. Patent 4,623,594) in view of Sugimoto et al is respectfully requested.

Although it is alleged that Keough expressly teaches a polyethylene wax emulsion in the composition forming a self-sustaining film, applicants respectfully submit that Keough is also defective in other limitations of the claimed invention.

For example, claim 5 (as currently amended) states that the composition comprises a methylemethacrylate resin base . . ." which is not found in Keough. Furthermore, although substrates contemplated for use in combination with the compositions of the present invention do include paper (column 3, lines 50-58), there is no teaching that the methylemethacrylate resin base is in direct contact with the paper layer as recited in claim 5 (as currently amended). Thus, applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Keough with Sugimoto et al still fails to teach the claimed invention. Furthermore, it is noted that previous claim 6, which was not rejected over either the combination of Keough and Sugimoto or, alternatively, over the combination of Keough and Sugimoto in view of Felter, makes the combination of limitations of previous claim 6 with claim 5 also free of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Accordingly, in view of the foregoing amendment, applicants respectfully submit that all claims are now in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnest solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Thomas P. Pavelko
Registration No. 31,689

TPP/mat
Attorney Docket No.: TPP 30482A

STEVENS, DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200 or (202) 408-5088

Date: July 19, 2004